

EX PARTE CR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

17 MAR 1993

Docket-222

POLICY & PLANNING  
BRANCH ROOM 5202

IN REPLY REFER TO:

7330-7/1700A3

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 24 1993

Honorable Rick Santorum  
House of Representatives  
1222 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Santorum:

This is in reply to your letter of February 27, 1993, ~~in~~ <sup>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>NOTICE OF THE SECRETARY</sup> ~~regarding~~ <sup>required on</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>behalf of your constituent, Martin G. Crawley,</sup> ~~Notice of~~ <sup>Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235. 57 FR 54034 (1992).</sup>

# Congressional

DUE: 3-11-93

PLEASE MAKE 2 EXTRA COPIES OF INCOMING, ATTACHMENTS,  
AND REPLY FOR DOCKET FILE, ROOM 222.

CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING SYSTEM  
03/03/93

## LETTER REPORT

CONTROL NO.	DATE RECEIVED	DATE OF CORRESP	DATE DUE	DATE DUE OLA(857)
9301025	03/03/93	02/27/93	03/23/93	

TITLE	MEMBERS NAME	REPLY FOR SIG OF
Congressman	Rick Santorum	BC

CONSTITUENT'S NAME	SUBJECT
Martin G Crawley	inq. comments on PR Docket 92-235

REF TO	REF TO	REF TO	REF TO
PRB/Lm 3-4-93			
DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE
03/03/93			

REMARKS: Respond to the attention of Wes Horne.

RICK SANTORUM  
18TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEE ON  
WAYS AND MEANS  
RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE  
ON HUMAN RESOURCES  
MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
OVERSIGHT

WASHINGTON OFFICE:  
1222 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3818  
(202) 225-2135

Congress of the United States  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515-3818

February 27, 1993

DISTRICT OFFICES:  
606 WEYMAN ROAD  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15236  
(412) 882-3205

541 FIFTH AVENUE  
MCKEESPORT, PA 15132  
(412) 664-4049

640 RODI ROAD  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15235  
(412) 882-3205

Legislative Affairs  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Director:

Enclosed with this letter is correspondence I received from one of my constituents regarding the FCC proposal PR Docket 92-235.

Any official response you could provide addressing the concerns stated in this letter would be appreciated.

PRb  
92-235  
1025

Martin G. Crawley  
10 Kiltie Drive  
Pittsburgh, PA 15235

January 22, 1993

The Honorable Richard John Santorum  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Re: NPRM - PR Docket 92-235

Dear Mr. Santorum:

**Please Vote AGAINST PR Docket 92-235!**

I am writing you concerning the proposed rule changes now being considered by the Federal Communication Commission outlined by the document PR Docket 92-235. This document calls for a massive frequency restructuring and would have extreme consequences for Remote Control (R/C)

Subject: Radio Control in the 72-76 MHz band

Question: What is the 72-76 MHz band used for?

Answer: The frequency range between 72-76 MHz is primarily a guard band between TV channels 4 and 5. Specifically, the channels between 72 and 76 MHz are licensed for use by 1) private and common carrier fixed station use at up to 300 watts output power (private and common carrier fixed use occurs on the same channels) and 2) private land mobile use at up to 1 watt output power. The channels between 72 and 76 MHz are also available for unlicensed secondary use by remote control operators of model aircraft, boats and cars at .75 watts output power.

Question: What is the relationship between fixed and mobile land mobile operations and radio control operations?

Answer: Radio control channels are located between fixed and mobile channels. The radio control channels overlap with the fixed and mobile channels. Radio control operations are unlicensed and are secondary to fixed and mobile operations. This means that radio control operations must accept interference from fixed and mobile users, and may not cause interference to such users.

Question: What changes are proposed in PR Docket 92-235 that have raised the concern of radio control operators?

Answer: We have proposed that over a 20 year period, 20 kHz mobile channels in the 72-76 MHz band be replaced with 5 kHz mobile channels. (See the attached page.) Apparently, radio control operators believe that this would make many of their frequencies unusable.

Question: Private land mobile, common carrier, and radio control users have peacefully shared spectrum in this band for many years. Would these changes lead to problems between various classes of users?

Answer: We can not categorically state that authorized mobile operations under the current or proposed rules could never harm radio control operations. However, in practice, all types of users can and do operate without conflict, although there are rare occurrences of interference between these users. We believe that under our proposed rules they should remain rare.

First, permitted power levels for both services are comparable. (For radio purposes, 3/4 of a watt is indistinguishable from 1 watt.) In approximate terms, this means that even if a factory and a radio control hobbyist shared a channel, which they would not under this proposal, the radio control user's model airplane would continue to stay under control as long as the plane is reasonably closer to the hobbyist's radio transmitter than the factory's radio transmitter. The fact that two users would not be using the exact same frequency significantly reduces risk of interference.